

Christopher J. Reichman SBN 250485  
PRATO & REICHMAN, APC  
8555 Aero Drive, Suite 303  
San Diego, CA 92123  
Telephone: 619-683-7971  
Email: [chrisr@prato-reichman.com](mailto:chrisr@prato-reichman.com)

Attorney for Plaintiff  
**PAUL SAPAN**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

PAUL SAPAN,

Case No.:

Plaintiff,  
vs.

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES,  
INCLUDING PUNITIVE  
DAMAGES, INTEREST AND  
ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND  
FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

CONSUMER CREDIT COUNSELING  
FOUNDATION, INC., A Florida  
Corporation, ISHWINDER JUDGE, an  
individual,

# **Violation(s) of Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 Trespass to Chattel Unfair Business Practices**

## Defendants.

COMES NOW Plaintiff PAUL SAPAN (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") who alleges as follows:

## **JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS**

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of the  
2 County of Los Angeles, but has recently moved to the county of Orange, State of  
3 California.  
4

5. Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation, Inc. (“Consumer  
6 Credit Counseling Foundation”) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a  
7 Florida Corporation, doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of  
8 California.  
9

10. Defendant Ishwinder Judge, is, and at all times herein mentioned was,  
11 doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.  
12

13. This case is filed pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act  
14 of 1991, 47 U.S.C. §227 et. seq. The U.S. Supreme Court recently decided that  
15 federal courts have federal question subject matter jurisdiction over such civil  
16 actions under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Services, LLC*, --  
17 U.S. --, 132 S.Ct. 740, 753 (2012). The state law claim herein arises out of a  
18 common nucleus of operative facts and is subject to supplemental jurisdiction  
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.  
20

21. At all times herein mentioned each defendant was the partner, agent  
22 and employee of each co-defendant herein and was at all times acting within the  
23 scope of such partnership, agency and employment and each defendant ratified the  
24 conduct of each co-defendant herein.  
25

## FACTUAL SUMMARY

6. Defendants made six (6) live calls to PAUL SAPAN's home phone  
7 number (310-444-1999) wherein they tried to pitch legal services on the following  
8 dates and times and using the following Caller ID ("CID") numbers:

- 9 • August 9, 2012 at 2:27pm, CID 949-502-0318
- 10 • August 10, 2012 at 11:52am, CID 949-502-0318
- 11 • August 28, 2012 at 3:50pm, CID 949-502-0318
- 12 • September 5, 2012 at 3:41pm, CID 949-502-0318
- 13 • September 6, 2012 at 3:18pm, CID 949-502-0318
- 14 • September 7, 2012 at 11:24 am, CID 949-502-0318

15 7. Mr. Sapan's home phone has been listed on the federal "Do Not Call"  
16 registry maintained by the Federal Trade Commission from December 23, 2007 to  
17 the present.

18 8. While each of the calls complained of above used the Caller ID  
19 number, they did not transmit Caller ID name information as required by law.  
20 47 C.F.R. § 64.1601(e).

21 9. On August 9, 2012 at 2:27 pm Defendants called Mr. Sapan from CID  
22 949-502-0318.

23 10. Mr. Sapan answered the above mention called made by Defendants,  
24 but no one comes on the line.

25 11. On August 10, 2012 at 11:52 am, Defendants called Mr. Sapan from  
26 CID 949-502-0318.

1       12. Mr. Sapan did not answer.

2       13. On August 28, 2012 at 3:50 pm, Defendants called Mr. Sapan from  
3       CID 949-502-0318.

4       14. On September 5, 2012 at 3:41 pm Defendants called Mr. Sapan from  
5       CID 949-502-0318.

6       15. Mr. Sapan answered the above mention called made by Defendants,  
7       but no one comes on the line.

8       16. On September 6, 2012 at 3:18 pm Defendant called Mr. Sapan from  
9       CID 949-502-0318.

10       17. Mr. Sapan did not answer.

11       18. On September 7, 2012 at 11:24 am Defendant called Mr. Sapan from  
12       CID 949-502-0318.

13       19. During the call, “Rick” of Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation  
14       attempted to pitch Mr. Sapan credit remediation services.

15       20. Mr. Sapan feigned interest to find out who was behind the illegal  
16       calls.

17       21. “Rick” transferred the call to “Helen” of the Consumer Credit  
18       Counseling Foundations, where she continued to pitch Mr. Sapan credit  
19       remediation services.

1 22. Now that Mr. Sapan knew who was calling him, he told Helen to Do-  
2 Not-Call and that he was not interested.

3 23. All six (6) alleged calls made by Defendants to Mr. Sapan used the  
4 same CID number 949-502-0318.

5 24. Mr. Sapan alleges on information belief that the calls transmitted to  
6 him that he did not answer were made by Defendants in order to pitch him the  
7 same credit remediation services they pitched in the calls he did answer.

8 25. Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation is listed as an  
9 active Florida Corporation.

10 26. A true and correct copy of Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling  
11 Foundation's business filings with the Florida Secretary of State is attached hereto  
12 as Exhibit 1 and is incorporated herein as if set forth verbatim.

13 27. While Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation is  
14 registered as a Florida Corporation, it is located in California with its principle  
15 business address is listed at 2150 Portola Avenue, Suite D186, Livermore, CA  
16 94551.

17 28. A true and correct copy of Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling  
18 Foundation's business filings with the California Secretary of State containing the  
19 principal Defendant's principal business address is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and  
20 is incorporated herein as if set forth verbatim.

1       29. The Florida Secretary of State lists Defendant Ishwander Judge as the  
2 President, Secretary, and Treasurer of Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling  
3 Foundation.  
4

5       30. Defendant Ishwinder Judge is, and at all times herein mentioned is,  
6 the owner of Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation.  
7

8       31. After conducting a thorough examination of Defendant Consumer  
9 Credit Counseling Foundation's tax records, there is no indication that any  
10 employees work for the company other than its owner, Ishwander Judge.  
11

12       32. Defendant Ishwinder Judge is fully liable for the calls here, because  
13 Defendant Consumer Credit Counseling Foundation is a very small company with  
14 no other managers nor employees.  
15

16       33. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that Defendant Ishwinder  
17 Judge made the violative calls, ordered them made, knew the calls described above  
18 were being made and did nothing, or was willfully and recklessly ignorant of the  
19 fact his company was making the calls described above.  
20

22       34. Mr. Sapan has been harmed by the junk calls complained of herein by  
23 the direct waste of his time during the calls themselves, the indirect waste of time  
24 in having to break from other important tasks and spend time catching up after  
25 these junk calls, the waste of telephone service which he and not Defendants must  
26

1 pay for, the costs of having to pursue legal remedies, and in the aggravation and  
2 consequent health effects of stress these illegal intrusions have caused.  
3  
4

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 [TCPA Do Not Call List Violations – For all six (6) calls]  
7  
8

9 35. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs above and incorporates them herein  
10 by reference.  
11  
12

13 36. Plaintiff is bringing this action pursuant to the provisions of the  
14 Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (47 U.S.C. §227 and 47 C.F.R.  
15 §64.1200 – “TCPA”).  
16  
17

18 37. Subdivision (c) (2) of Section 64.1200 of Title 47 of the Code of  
19 Federal Regulations makes it unlawful for any person to “initiate any telephone  
20 solicitation” to “A residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her  
21 telephone number on the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish  
22 to receive telephone solicitations”.  
23  
24

25 38. At all times relevant to this complaint, Plaintiff had registered his  
26 residential telephone number on the national do-not-call registry maintained by the  
27 U.S. Government.  
28

29 39. Defendants have called Plaintiff’s residential telephone line for  
30 solicitation purposes during the statutory period of the last 4 years, pursuant to 28  
31 U.S.C. § 1658. These calls are the only calls known to Plaintiff at this time and  
32

1 Plaintiff states on information and belief, without yet having the aid of full  
2 discovery, that it is quite likely that Defendant has made many more violative calls  
3 to Plaintiff's residential telephone line. These calls were not made in error, nor did  
4 Defendant have express permission from Plaintiff to call, nor did Defendant have a  
5 personal relationship with Plaintiff. 37 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (c) (i), (ii), & (iii).

6  
7 40. Subdivision (c)(5) of section 227 of title 47 of the United States Code  
8 permits a private right of action in state court for violations the national do-not-call  
9 registry rules promulgated thereunder. Plaintiff may obtain relief in the form of  
10 injunctive relief, or Plaintiff may recover \$500.00 for each violation, or both. If  
11 the court finds that defendants' violations were willful or knowing, it may, in its  
12 discretion, award up to three times that amount.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 [Trespass to Chattel- For all six (6) calls]

19  
20 41. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs above and incorporates them herein  
21 by reference.

22  
23 42. The conduct by defendants complained of herein, namely illegally  
24 calling Plaintiff's phone, constitutes an electronic trespass to chattel.

25  
26 43. At no time did Plaintiff consent to this trespass.

27  
28 44. As a proximate result of these intrusions, Plaintiff suffered damage in  
an amount according to proof, but no less than 10% of his monthly phone bills in

1 July and August of 2013 since Defendants calls constituted 10% or more of the  
2 total calls to his phone at the height of their junk calling campaign.

3 45. In making the illegal calls described above, defendants were guilty of  
5 oppression and malice, in that defendants made said calls with the intent to vex,  
6 injure, or annoy Plaintiff or with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's  
7 rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of punitive damages.

9

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 [Engaging in Unfair Business Practices- For all six (6) calls]

12 46. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs above and incorporates them herein  
13 by reference.

14 47. Because these telephone calls violate federal statutes, they are  
15 unlawful business practices within the meaning of section 17200 of the Business  
16 and Professions Code.

17 48. As a proximate result of these intrusions, Plaintiff suffered damage in  
18 an amount according to proof, but no less than 6% of his monthly phone bills in  
19 August and September of 2012 since Defendants calls constituted 6% or more of  
20 the total calls to his phone during this time.

21 49. Section 17203 of the Business and Professions Code entitles Plaintiff  
22 to an injunction enjoining defendants from engaging in unfair or unlawful business  
23 practices.

1 WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of  
2 them, as follows:

3  
4 On the FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 5 1. For an award of \$500.00 for each violation of 47 C.F.R. §64.1200 (c)  
6 (2);  
7 2. For an award of \$1,500.00 for each such violation found to have been  
8 willful;

9 On the SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 10 3. For compensatory damages according to proof;  
11 4. For punitive damages;

12 On the THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

- 13 5. For preliminary and permanent injunctions, enjoining Defendants, and  
14 each of them, from engaging in unfair or unlawful business practices  
15 pursuant to section 17203 of the Business and Professions Code;

16 On ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

- 17 6. For attorney's fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §  
18 1021.5.  
19 7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and  
20 8. For such further relief as the Court deems proper.

22 DATED: November 18, 2015

**PRATO & REICHMAN, APC**

23  
24  
25 /s/Christopher J. Reichman, Esq.  
26 By: Christopher J. Reichman, Esq.  
27 **Prato & Reichman, APC**  
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
PAUL SAPAN